

Remarks

Claims 1, 3 – 10, and 13 - 28

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 - 10, and 13 - 28 as being anticipated by Emery. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites a system for providing integrated control of at least one communication service provided by at least one communication service provider comprising at least one integrated services controller (“ISC”) in which the ISC is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for the one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules. The Examiner states that “Emery discloses that at least one ISC is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for the one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules”. The Applicant respectfully disagrees because, among other reasons, Emery does not teach processing of an ISC. In the passage in column 18 of Emery referenced by the Examiner, Emery discloses a PCS handset registration process that allows the mobile PCS handset to register with a PCS microcell controller as opposed to a cellular mobile controller in the same area. In other words, the prioritized registration process that Emery teaches is related to registration for mobility controllers, not the processing of an ISC. The applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 10 but as now amended to deleted the reference to another ISC. Specifically, claim 1 now recites that the system entities include at least one of: a transport association controller (TAC), an association state manager (ASM), and a message broker (MB).

The Examiner states that Emery discloses such in column 13, lines 56 - 67. Of the components listed here in Emery (e.g., Service Management System, “SMS”; a Data and Reporting System, “DRS”; Service Control Point, “SCP”; and a Service Creation Environment, “SCE”), none of these remotely resembles the TAC, the ASM, and/or the MB.

Emery states that the SCP is essentially a central data base. *See* column 2, line 52 of Emery. Emery states that the SCE is a terminal subsystem for programming the data base in the SCP. *See* column 13, lines 16 – 63 of Emery. Emery does not even define the SMS or the DRS. The Applicant assumes that these are not defined in any of the parent cases of Emery either because Emery is the result of a divisional and therefore should have the same specification as

the parent. Having no definition, Applicants can only turn to Newton's Telecom dictionary as a reasonable source for such terms. Newton's refers to an SMS as an operation support system used to facilitate the provisioning and administration of service data required by the SCP.

Conversely, TAC incorporates a transport control layer that defines a communication state model. The transport control layer includes transport control channels for communicating to a network such as Public Switched Telephone Networks ("PSTN"), optical switching networks, the Internet, and local area networks ("LAN"). See page 10, lines 9 - 18. The ASM provides a state model for controlling a specific transport association as well as managing the relationship between a Transport Channel ("TC"), a Transport Channel Access Bridge ("TCAB"), and an Access Portal ("AP"). See page 23, lines 20 - 23. The MB may use a customer classification as criteria to determine the order to relay messages it receives on to other system entities. It is clear that the Examiner has a fundamental misunderstanding of the Applicant's claims and/or Emery because, as one example, the Examiner asserts that transport control for communicating to a network such as a PSTN is analogous to anything that Emery teaches in column 13, lines 16 - 63 (i.e., SCP, SCE, SMS, or DRS).

Claims 3 -9 and 11 - 28 depend from independent claim 1 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim, these claims include additional features that further distinguish from Emery.

Claims 29- 56

In the advisory action, the Examiner rejected claim 29 as being anticipated by Emery; the Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the Examiner's rejection of claim 29, the Examiner provided the same reasons for the rejection recited in the rejection of claim 1. Since the language of claim 29 is nearly identical to that of claim 1, the arguments made in favor patentability for claim 1 apply herein as well with all differences being considered. Additionally, the applicant has amended claim 29 in a manner similar to claim 1. Claims 31 - 37 and 39 - 56 depend from independent claim 29 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent 1, 3 - 10, and 13 - 28. Accordingly, the arguments that applied to claims 1, 3 - 10, and 13 - 28 respectively apply herein as well. The Applicant maintains that claims 31 - 37 and 39 - 56 - 53 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such disposition.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that the Applicant's arguments are deemed not persuasive, the Applicant respectfully requests a prompt reply so that the Applicant will have sufficient time to frame the application for appeal. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Gregory T. Fetting
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(303) 338-0997

Date: Oct. 24, 2005